Appeal: 14-6044 Doc: 5 Filed: 03/05/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6044

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DENNIS SCOTT MCCULLOUGH,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:06-cr-00389-REP-1; 3:13-cv-00688-REP)

Submitted: February 27, 2014 Decided: March 5, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dennis Scott McCullough, Appellant Pro Se. Angela Mastandrea-Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dennis Scott McCullough seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that McCullough has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

Appeal: 14-6044 Doc: 5 Filed: 03/05/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED